AD-A242 518

IIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIII

REPORT ON THE
SURVEY OF USAWC GRADUATES
FROM ACADEMIC YEARS 1983-1987

91-14731

IIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIII

by
Glenda Y. Nogami, Ph.D.
and
Robert J. Davis, COL, U.S. Army

January 1989

REPORT DOCUMENTATION PAGE

1a. REPORT SECURITY CLASSIFICATION	1b. RESTRICTIVE MARKINGS
Unclassified	

2a. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION AUTHORITY	3. DISTRIBUTION / AVAILABILITY OF REPORT
2b. DECLASSIFICATION / DOWNGRADING SCHEDULE	Approved for public release; distribution unlimited.

4. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION REPORT NUMBER(S)	5. MONITORING ORGANIZATION REPORT NUMBER(S)

6a. NAME OF PERFORMING ORGANIZATION	6b. OFFICE SYMBOL (If applicable)	7a. NAME OF MONITORING ORGANIZATION
U.S. Army War College	AWCA	

6c. ADDRESS (City, State, and ZIP Code)	7b. ADDRESS (City, State, and ZIP Code)
Carlisle Barracks Carlisle, PA 17013-5050	

8a. NAME OF FUNDING / SPONSORING ORGANIZATION	8b. OFFICE SYMBOL (If applicable)	9. PROCUREMENT INSTRUMENT IDENTIFICATION NUMBER

8c. ADDRESS (City, State, and ZIP Code)	10. SOURCE OF FUNDING NUMBERS			
	PROGRAM ELEMENT NO.	PROJECT NO.	TASK NO.	WORK UNIT ACCESSION NO.

11. TITLE (Include Security Classification)
Report on the Survey of USAWC Graduates from Academic Years 1983-1987

12. PERSONAL AUTHOR(S)
Nogami, Glenda Y. and Davis, Robert J.

13a. TYPE OF REPORT	13b. TIME COVERED	14. DATE OF REPORT (Year, Month, Day)	15. PAGE COUNT
Final	FROM _____ TO _____	8901	58

16. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTATION

17. COSATI CODES			18. SUBJECT TERMS (Continue on reverse if necessary and identify by block number)
FIELD	GROUP	SUB-GROUP	U.S. Army War College, MEL-1, Graduates, Outcomes Assessment, Curriculum

19. ABSTRACT (Continue on reverse if necessary and identify by block number)

A survey of U.S. Army War College graduates from Academic Years 1983 to 1987 was conducted in the summer of 1988. The purposes of the survey were two-fold: (1) to evaluate the relevance of the curriculum in accomplishing its mission to educate and prepare students for senior leadership positions, and (2) to provide input for curriculum improvement. The survey was composed of three separate sections: (1) demographic information, (2) evaluations of the utility of USAWC curriculum to assignment, and (3) suggestions for improving the curriculum.

The data from 1,111 Army officers indicated that USAWC prepared its students well for future assignments. Every curriculum topic taught at USAWC had been useful to at least some graduates in their current positions. Although there was no consensus on which topics should be deleted or added to the curriculum, all suggestions will be considered by the USAWC faculty and staff.

20. DISTRIBUTION / AVAILABILITY OF ABSTRACT	21. ABSTRACT SECURITY CLASSIFICATION
☐ UNCLASSIFIED/UNLIMITED ☐ SAME AS RPT. ☐ DTIC USERS	

22a. NAME OF RESPONSIBLE INDIVIDUAL	22b. TELEPHONE (Include Area Code)	22c. OFFICE SYMBOL

DD Form 1473, JUN 86 *Previous editions are obsolete.* SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE

TABLE OF CONTENTS

REPORT ON THE
SURVEY OF USAWC GRADUATES
FROM ACADEMIC YEARS 1983-1987

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Requirement:

The U.S. Army War College (USAWC) is the Army's Senior
Service School, educating the very best of the Army Officer
Corps. In its 83-year history, the USAWC has constantly sought
to improve its curriculum to meet the needs of senior Army
officers. As part of this effort, the College conducted a survey
of its graduates from Academic Years 1983-1987.

The purposes of the survey were two-fold: (1) to evaluate
the relevance of the curriculum in accomplishing its mission to
educate and prepare students for senior leadership positions, and
(2) to prepare the College for future trends and long term
educational objectives.

Procedure:

One thousand one-hundred and eleven (1,111) Army officers
who graduated from the USAWC from AY 1983 to 1987, and who were
still on active duty in the Winter of 1988 were sent a survey to
complete. These officers had completed either the Resident or
the Corresponding Studies Courses at USAWC.

The survey was composed of three separate sections: (1)
demographic information (current assignment, branch, rank, etc.),
(2) evaluations of utility of curriculum topics to assignment,
and (3) open-ended questions on "most useful topics," "least
useful topics," new topic suggestions, etc. Forty-seven (47)
separate USAWC topics were listed for the utility evaluations.
These represent current topics at the USAWC.

Results:

From the data, one can conclude that the USAWC prepared its
students well for future assignments. There were seven topics
that were "very" to "extremely useful" across all branches, year
groups, and assignments. These are:

1. Major issues in leading the Army.
2. Assessing your general health and fitness.
3. Formulating U.S. military and national security
       strategy.
4. Effective oral and written communications.
5. U.S. Army roles, mission and doctrine.
6. The planning, programming and budgeting system.
7. How the Army resources, sustains and mobilizes forces.

ii

However, it appears that almost every topic that is taught at USAWC has been "most helpful" to at least some students. Perceived "helpfulness" is very much dependent on the position the officer holds. With the great diversity of jobs that USAWC graduates are assigned, it is not surprising that every topic listed was rated to be very helpful by at least a small group of graduates.

There was no consensus about what should be added or eliminated from the curriculum. For every suggestion that a specific subject should be shortened or eliminated, there was an equally compelling argument for increasing the depth or length of the course. If there was something seriously wrong with the curriculum, more agreement would have been expected.

Recommendations:

In order to identify topics that are of import to the greatest number of graduates as they develop into positions of increasing responsibility, it is recommended that an annual or biennial survey of graduates be conducted. This would provide a longitudinal database to identify skills by position over time-- as both the officer and the positions evolved. This would aid in helping to prepare the College to anticipate future trends and (to revise the curriculum to meet) long term educational objectives. In these surveys, graduates would be asked to focus not only on their current position, but also on changes they anticipate in the next three to ten years and the additional skills and content knowledge their successors will need.

In addition to the above surveys, information from sources other than the active duty graduate is needed. Utility of topics and effectiveness of learning and applying these topics must also be rated by the senior officer graduates' supervisors, by USAWC faculty, and also by graduates who have left the Army. Input from the futures planners and programmers, the very highest senior officers of the Army and the other services will be required to provide the USAWC a futures orientation and projection of senior officer needs and requirements into the next two decades. All of this information will have to be gathered on a periodic basis if the USAWC is to be proactive in the world of senior officer education.

REPORT ON
SURVEY OF USAWC GRADUATES
FROM ACADEMIC YEARS 1983-1987

INTRODUCTION

The U.S. Army War College (USAWC) is the Army's Senior
Service School, educating the very best of the Army Officer
Corps. In its 83-year history, the USAWC has constantly sought
to improve its curriculum to meet the needs of senior Army
Officers. Improvements have come from its faculty, students (end
of course and end of year evaluations), Senior Officer Reviews
(Dougherty Panel, 1987), Congressional Committees (Defense
Reorganization Act, 1986; Skelton Commission, 1988), and
interested others (Murray, 1986/87; and Rostow and Endicott,
1987).

As part of this continuing effort, the U.S. Army War
College conducted a survey of its graduates from Academic Years
(AY) 1983 to 1987 in January 1988. The purpose of this survey
was to determine whether USAWC was "fulfilling its primary
mission to educate and prepare students for senior leadership
positions".

It was further stated that: "The survey (would) be used to
gather information to evaluate the relevancy of the current War
College curriculum in accomplishing its mission as well as to
properly prepare the College for future trends and long term
educational objectives". The graduates were asked to assess the
helpfulness and value of curriculum topics to performance on
their current jobs.

It should be noted that the curriculum of each Academic
Year from 1983 to 1987 differed significantly. For example,
there were 15 Courses in the Common Overview (now called Core
Curriculum) in 1983, 10 in 1984 and 1985, and 7 in 1986 and
1987--although the total number of weeks allocated to the Core
Curriculum has remained relatively constant over time (33-34
weeks each year). In addition, the configuration of study topics
within each course changed from year to year. The number of
advanced courses ranged from 77 in 1985 to 49 in 1987. Table 1
presents an overview of changes in the curriculum from year to
year (based on the Overview in each year's Curriculum Pamphlet).

TABLE 1

CURRICULUM OVERVIEW
FOR ACADEMIC YEARS 1983 – 1987

ACADEMIC YEARS	83	84	85	86	87
COMMON OVERVIEW					
* COURSES	15	10	10	7	7
TIME IN WEEKS	33	33	33	34	34
ADVANCED COURSES					
* COURSES	55	61	77	54	49
TIME IN WEEKS	10	10	10	9	9
NSS (TIME IN WEEKS)	1	1	1	1	1

2

Table 2 indicates the topics within each core course as specified in the Curriculum Pamphlets. The topics were taught at the USAWC between Academic Years 1983 - 1988. The fifteen major headings were the course titles in AY 1983. Although there were fewer core courses in AY 1988, for ease of reference, we will remain with the AY 1983 categorization.

METHODOLOGY

Survey Respondent Population

All 1,111 Army officers who graduated from the USAWC from AY 1983 to 1987, and who were still on Active Duty (not on retired status) in the Winter of 1988 were asked to participate in the survey. These officers had completed the Resident or the Corresponding Studies or Senior Service College Fellow Programs at the USAWC.

The roster of graduates was received from the USAWC Alumni Office, and current addresses were received from the Total Army Personnel Agency (TAPA). Surveys were mailed to the graduates. A postage paid return envelope was included to encourage participation. No follow-up of nonrespondents was attempted due to the shortage of personnel and time.

Survey Instrument

The survey instrument was divided into three distinct segments: one--demographic information about the officer, two--evaluations of "usefulness" of curriculum topics to their present assignment, and three--open-ended questions. The curriculum topics were divided into six USAWC academic themes of (1) leading other professionals, (2) working in the strategic environment, (3) serving in joint and combined commands, (4) directing Army and DoD Systems, (5) commanding at the operational level, and (6) planning/operating theater/global forces. The open-ended questions focused on suggestions for topics for deletion, new topics for inclusion, most helpful topics, and personal comments. A copy of the survey is at Appendix A.

Analysis

The data were analyzed using the SPSS-PC statistical packages. The descriptive analyses includes means, frequencies, percentages, modes, and cross-tabulations of data. Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) techniques were utilized in identifying specific subgroup differences (i.e., between Resident Course and

TABLE 2

COMMON COURSE OVERVIEW
CORE CURRICULUM FOR AY 1983-1987

COURSE AND TOPICS

REQUIREMENTS OF THE PROFESSIONAL
  Self Assessment
  Org Dynamics & Leadership
  Ethics & Professionalism
  Sr. Leadership Mgmt/Decisionmaking
  Human Dimension of Combat
  Sr. Leadership Command & Mgmt

WAR, POLITICS, POWER & STRATEGY
  Theory of War
  Elements of Power
  Nat'l Security Policy & Process
  Nat'l & Military Strategy
  Strategic Concepts
  Global Issues
  Vietnam Study
  Strategic Planning

DOD DECISIONMAKING*
  Decisionmaking: Theory & Tools
  OSD Management
  Army/DOD Decisionmaking
  Financial Mgmt (PPBS)
  Strategic Planning
  Operational Planning & JOPS
  War Planning
  Joint Forces
  Operations & Doctrine
  Force Capabilities
  Decisionmaking Exercise

COURSE AND TOPICS

**LEADERSHIP OF THE ARMY/MGMT ITS
SUPPORTING SYSTEMS**
  Manning
  Training
  Modernizing
  Supporting
  Commanding
  Resource Decisionmaking Exercise
  Mobilizing
  Force Modernization Case Study
  Mobilization Exercise
  Develop
  Acquire
  Sustain
  Force Integration Case Study
  Resource

U.S. MILITARY FORCES
  Roles and Missions
  JCS
  U.S. Commands
  CONUS Forces
  Reserve Components
  Mobilization
  Mobilization Analysis

U.S. MILITARY DOCTRINE
  Air-Land Doctrine
  Command and Control (C2)
  Tactical Intelligence
  Corps
  EAC
  Large Unit Planning & Operations
  Large Unit CPX

COURSE AND TOPICS

SOVIET STUDIES
   Background
   Strategy
   Doctrine
   Capabilities
   U.S.-Soviet Force Comparison
   U.S.-Soviet War Game
   R.A. (Eastern Europe & the Soviet Union)
   Decisionmaking Exercise

GLOBAL INTRODUCTION
   Application of Power
   Alliances
   Conflict Management

GENERAL WAR I (NUCLEAR)
   Nuclear Capabilities
   Nuclear Effects
   Post Nuclear Reconstruction
   Political/Military Simulation--Global
   Policy
   Strategy

IN PEACETIME
   Alternative Uses of Power
   Security Assistance
   Regional Appraisal
   Regional Appraisal (Africa)

COUNTER-INSURGENCY
   Theory of Revolution
   Doctrines of Insurgency/Counter-Insurgency
   Political/Military Simulation
   Regional Appraisal (Latin America)

COURSE AND TOPICS

FORCE PROJECTION
Contingency Planning
Strategic Mobility
Strategic Logistics
Contingency Planning Exercise
Regional Appraisal (Middle East/Southwest
  Asia)
Strategic Projection
Foreign Internal Defense
Low Intensity Operations
Force Projection Exercise
Revolutionary War Exercise

LIMITED WAR
  Operational Doctrine
  Military Objectives & Limited
    Political Aims
  Korea Simulation
  Regional Appraisal (Asia)

GENERAL WAR II (NATO)
  Air-Land Battle
  Alliances
  TNF (Tactical Nuclear Force)
  NATO Wargame
  Regional Appraisal (Europe)
  Theatre Operational Concepts
  Support Concepts
  Campaign Planning
  Theatre Planning Exercise
  Theatre Employment Planning

COURSE AND TOPICS

GLOBAL APPRAISAL (COURSE SYNTHESIS)
  Military Strategy
  Forces
  Risks
  Alternatives
  Organization
  Requirements
  Capabilities
  Shortfalls
  Issues
  Strategy Formulation Exercise
  Critique of Mid-Range Defense Policy/
    Strategy and Force Planning

Corresponding Course graduates, combat arms vs. combat support vs. combat service support branches). However, it was felt that these analyses provided information of marginal value. Consequently, the data presented in this report will be descriptive only.

RESULTS

Response Rate

From the total sample (population) of 1,111 officers from AY 1983 to AY 1987, 775 responses were received. Seven respondents were identified as ineligible because they had either retired or graduated from other Senior Service Schools (Navy War College, Air War College, etc.). Forty-three surveys were uncompleted and returned due to wrong addresses.

TOTAL SAMPLE:	1,111
Total Returns:	775
Ineligibles:	- 7
Returned, wrong address: (uncompleted)	- 43
VALID RESPONSES:	725

65.9% Total Response Rate (732 / 1,111)

68.3% Response Rate on Valid Responses (725 / 1,061)

A nearly 66% response rate on a one-time mail survey with no follow-ups is very respectable. Soldier Support Center-National Capitol Region (SSC-NCR) normally receives a 60-65% response rate with their semi-annual Soldier Survey. This response rate, though, is probably a conservative figure. It assumes that everyone of the 1,111 Officers actually received the survey and that 336 of them chose not to respond.

It is highly probable that the "cooperation rate" is much higher. A "cooperation rate" is a modified response rate formula which uses only eligibles who actually received the survey and had the opportunity to respond. The denominator, then, eliminates those who had not received the survey and therefore, did not have an opportunity to respond.

Although every attempt is made to keep the Officer Master File (OMF) current and accurate, addresses are often incorrect due to the frequent and rapid permanent changes of station (PCSs) that officers experience. Hence, we cannot accurately calculate the number of surveys that did not reach their intended recipient (where the graduate would not have had the opportunity to respond). Construction of an accurate cooperation rate is also complicated because we cannot be sure that all surveys sent to ineligibles and all surveys sent to eligibles with incorrect addresses were returned to the USAWC.

Recoding of Data

Assignment. The survey listed twelve separate categories for current assignment: (1) Command, (2) Personnel, (3) Intelligence, (4) Plans and Operations, (5) Logistics and Procurement, (6) Research and Development, (7) Communications/ Information Management, (8) Comptroller, (9) Education and Training, (10) Civilian Military Affairs, (11) Foreign Area Officer, and (12) Other. In consultation with other members of the Directorate of Academic Affairs at the Army War College (USAWC-DAA), these twelve categories were reduced to four categories: (a) Command, (b) Staff, (c) Education and Training, and (d) Other. Personnel, Intelligence, Plans and Operations, Logistics and Procurement, Research and Development, Communications/Information Management, and Comptroller categories were combined into the recoded "Personnel/Staff" category. Education and Training remained the same, and Civilian Military Affairs, Foreign Area Officer and Other were combined into the "Other" category.

There were a total of 25 Reserve and National Guard respondents and 10 female officers from all year groups in the sample. These numbers were considered too small for statistical confidence. Consequently, these 34 Officers (one female was also a Reservist) were deleted from the analyses. However, the data is on the database and can be analyzed separately, as needed.

All the data reported here will therefore include only Regular Army, Active duty males. This resulted in 691 valid cases for analysis.

Demographic Data

The following tables describe the respondent population by Academic Year Groups, Instructional Program, Current Grade, Current Grade by Year Group, Branch, Current Level of Assignment, and Current Job Assignment (Tables 3 to 9).

The respondents were relatively well distributed by Academic Year groups, with AY 1985 and AY 1986 better represented than other year groups. There was an over-representation of Resident course graduates to Corresponding Studies graduates. Over 70% of the survey respondents were from the AWC Resident Course and 27% from the Corresponding Studies Course, although for each of the year groups, the total number of students graduating was approximately the same.

The vast majority of the respondents were colonels or lieutenant colonel-promotable (88.8%). As could be expected, the majority of recent graduates (67.8%) were lieutenant colonels and lieutenant colonel-promotables, and 11.5% of the AY 1983 and 1984 graduates were brigadier generals or colonel-promotables.

The graduate respondents were found in all levels of assignment, but primarily in Brigade (20.8%), Major Support Command (18.1%) or Major Command HQ (17.5%). The graduates came from all positions; thirty-eight (38.5%) percent were in Personnel/Staff positions, 24% in Command, 9.6% in Education and Training positions, and nearly 28% in "Other" kinds of positions.

TABLE 3
ACADEMIC YEAR GROUPS

AY	1983		105 (15.2)
	1984		129 (18.7)
	1985		168 (24.3)
	1986		171 (24.7)
	1987		118 (17.1)
	TOTAL		691 (100%)

TABLE 4
INSTRUCTIONAL PROGRAM

AWC Resident Course	495 (71.6)
AWC Corr. Studies Program	187 (27.1)
SSC Fellow	9 (1.3)
TOTAL	691 (100%)

TABLE 5
CURRENT GRADE

Lieutenant Colonel	63	(9.1)
Lieutenant Colonel (Promotable)	95	(13.7)
Colonel	519	(75.1)
Colonel (Promotable)	8	(1.2)
Brigadier General	6	(0.9)
TOTAL	691	(100%)

TABLE 6

CURRENT GRADE BY ACADEMIC YEAR

	1987	1986	1985	1984	1983
LTC	30.5	9.4	4.8	0.8	1.9
LTC (P)	37.3	22.8	6.0	1.6	
COL	32.2	67.3	89.3	93.8	90.5
COL (P)		0.6		2.3	3.8
BG				1.6	3.8

TABLE 7
BRANCH

Combat	353	(51.1)
Combat Support	155	(22.4)
Combat Service Support	168	(24.3)
Other	15	(2.2)
TOTAL	691	(100%)

TABLE 8
CURRENT LEVEL OF ASSIGNMENT

Departmental	51	(7.4)
Joint Staff	78	(11.3)
Military Service HQ	70	(10.1)
Allied Command	13	(1.9)
Major Command HQ	121	(17.5)
MSC	125	(18.1)
Brigade	144	(20.8)
Other	89	(12.9)
TOTAL	691	(100%)

TABLE 9
CURRENT JOB ASSIGNMENT

Command	166	(24.0)
Personnel/Staff	266	(38.5)
Education/Training	66	(9.6)
Other	193	(27.9)
	691	(100%)

Survey Data: Usefulness of Course Topics

This section of the report will present and discuss the results of the second section of the survey: the graduates' ratings of the usefulness of each of thirty-seven topics to their current assignment.   A seven-point scale was used in the survey:

    1 = Does not apply
    2 = Not useful at all
    3 = A little useful
    4 = Somewhat useful
    5 = Very useful
    6 = Extremely useful
    7 = I don't remember

For the analyses reported here, "does not apply" and "I don't remember" categories were eliminated (see below).   The survey instructions indicated that "if a particular topic was not covered in sufficient depth for you to evaluate usefulness, please respond with does not apply".   If a respondent either had not been exposed to the topic at the War College or could not remember, the response is not valid in determining usefulness.

Table 10 indicates the percentage of respondents who either responded "does not apply" or "I don't remember" to each topic. Several topics are noteworthy for the large percentage of respondents for whom these topics may not have been presented and are, therefore, not applicable or not remembered.   These are:

Application of word processing and other
        automation/computer skills   23.7%

Space as a potential military environment   16.5%

The influence the reorganization of JCS
        has on planning, doctrine and
        execution   20.5%

TABLE II

PERCENT OF RESPONDENTS FOR WHOM USAWC TOPICS WERE
"NOT APPLICABLE" OR WHICH THEY "DON'T REMEMBER"

LEAD OTHER PROFESSIONALS	PERCENT
10. Major issues in leading the Army.	4.7
11. Principles techniques of the sr. leader.	3.2
12. Assessing your general health & fitness.	5.0
13. Physical fitness related to unit effectiveness.	7.4
14. Organization & functions of non-military agencies.	5.3
15. Application of word processing automation/computer.	22.7

WORK IN STRATEGIC ENVIRONMENTS	
16. Formulating military national security strategy.	4.7
17. Strategy & development of force structure.	4.3
18. Soviet economic, political, & foreign policies.	5.1
19. Working of the global economy.	6.5
20. Functioning of U.S. economy & foreign policy.	5.5
21. Terrorism in today's global environment.	5.3
22. Military history--lessons learned.	4.2
23. Effective oral and written communication.	3.5
24. Practical briefing techniques.	12.9

SERVE IN JOINT AND COMBINED COMMANDS	
25. AL3 doctrine & applications.	9.2
26. Space as a potential military environment.	16.5
27. Capabilities & effects of Army weapon systems.	12.3
28. Reorganization of JCS on planning, doctrine, & execution.	21.5
29. NATO organization, doctrine, & operations.	7.4
30. DOD roles, mission, & doctrine.	5.1
31. U.S. Army roles, mission, & doctrine.	3.2
32. U.S. Navy roles, mission, & doctrine.	7.2
33. U.S. Air Force roles, mission, & doctrine.	6.2
34. U.S. Marine Corps roles, mission, & doctrine.	7.7
35. Formulating joint military doctrine.	9.6

DIRECT ARMY AND DOD SYSTEMS	
36. Planning, programming, & budgeting system.	2.2
37. How Army resources, sustains, & mobilizes forces.	2.9
38. Managing & developing the Army's Management Systems.	4.1

COMMAND AT THE OPERATIONAL LEVEL	
39. Impact of technology on modern warfare.	6.7
40. Analysis rear area doctrine & battle.	11.7
41. Joint strategic & operational planning.	6.1
42. Study & impact of low intensity conflict.	9.1

PLAN/OPERATE THEATER/GLOBAL FORCES	
43. Campaign planning at Unified Command level.	12.0
44. Strategic & operational level decisionmaking.	3.4
45. Analysis of U.S. military strategy.	6.5
46. Soviet Armed Forces: doctrine, operations, & capabilities.	3.1

Item analyses were only conducted for those respondents who could judge the usefulness of each topic to their current positions. This resulted in a five-point unidirectional scale from "not at all useful" to "extremely useful" (Categories 2 through 6 were recoded 1 to 5, with a midpoint of 3.0). Only graduates responding to these five categories were included in the analyses.

        1 = Not at all useful
        2 = A little useful
        3 = Somewhat useful
        4 = Very useful
        5 = Extremely useful

Usefulness for these respondents refers only to their present assignment, and was only rated when the topic was presented at the Army War College "in sufficient depth" to be evaluated. These ratings of usefulness are not generalizable to other positions the officers held and are retrospective to the curriculum at the War College during their class year. One additional limiter is that although these topics may be useful in their current positions, the ratings do not indicate how well they were taught at the War College, only that information on these topics is useful. These three issues are important in limiting the interpretation of the data.

In a later section of this report, we will discuss the specific courses or topics that students have identified which should be added to or dropped from the curriculum. These will include useful topics that were NOT covered at the War College while the graduates attended, but were suggested as additions to the curriculum; and less useful topics which were suggested for less time allocation or deletion from the curriculum.

In Table 11, the 37 items are listed in descending order of mean "usefulness" (1 = not useful at all, 5 = extremely useful) as rated by all the respondents. The mean score is listed at the far left followed by the USAWC topic number (as listed in the questionnaire) and the topic. The higher the mean score, the more "useful" was the topic to their current position.

(4.10) 12. Assessing your general health and fitness.
(3.93) 23. Effective oral and written communication.
(3.79) 10. Major issues in leading the Army.
(3.75) 31. U.S. Army roles, mission, and doctrine.
(3.73) 11. Principles and techniques of the senior leader.
(3.73) 36. The planning, programming, and budgeting system.
(3.67) 16. The process of formulating U.S. military and
             national security strategy.
(3.62) 22. Military history - lessons learned.
(3.61) 37. How the Army resources, sustains and mobilizes
             forces to support national military strategy.
(3.50) 17. Strategy and development of force structure.
(3.48) 45. The analysis of U.S. military strategy.
(3.45) 38. Managing and developing the Army's Management
             Systems.
(3.45) 24. The practical application of briefing techniques.
(3.44) 13. Physical fitness as related to unit effectiveness.
(3.43) 30. DOD roles, mission, and doctrine.
(3.30) 25. The AirLand Battle doctrine and its applications.
(3.29) 21. Terrorism in today's global environment.
(3.28) 20. The functioning of the U.S. economy and foreign
             policy.
(3.25) 41. Joint strategic and operational planning.
(3.24) 18. Soviet economic, political, and foreign policies.
(3.23) 39. The impact of technology on modern warfare.
(3.20) 46. The study of the Soviet Armed Forces in relation
             to doctrine, operations, and capabilities.
(3.19) 44. Strategic and operational level decisionmaking in
             the employment of U.S. Forces.
(3.17) 35. The process of formulating joint military doctrine.
(3.13) 19. The working of the global economy.
(3.13) 29. NATO organization, doctrine, and operations.
(3.12) 14. Organization and functions of nonmilitary agencies.
(3.09) 28. The influence the reorganization of JCS has on
             planning, doctrine and execution.
(3.03) 33. U.S. Air Force roles, mission, and doctrine.
(3.01) 43. Strategies of campaign planning at the Unified
             Command level.
(2.99) 15. Application of word processing and other automa-
             tion/computer skills.
(2.94) 42. The study and impact of low intensity conflict.
(2.91) 27. The capabilities and effects of U.S. Army weapon
             systems.
(2.91) 32. U.S. Navy roles, mission, and doctrine.
(2.87) 34. U.S. Marine Corps roles, mission, and doctrine.
(2.86) 40. Analysis of the U.S. Army rear area doctrine and
             battle.
(2.51) 26. Space as a potential military environment.

All topics were perceived to be useful by the graduates. There were no topics that were rated "not useful at all" by everyone. In general, broader topics or topics with a wider applicability were rated more useful than specific topics. For example, "assessing your general health and fitness" or "effective oral and written communication" are subjects which are applicable and useful regardless of the specific assignment. The above two items constitute more "skills" than content matter expertise as compared to the following two topics "analysis of the U.S. Army rear area doctrine and battle" and "space as a potential military environment."

The data were further analyzed for "mean" sub-group differences. Each of the following six pages lists the 37 topics and their usefulness to sub-groups in each descriptor. The sub-categories for each descriptor are on the right-hand side of the page. For example, the sub-categories under the descriptor "branch" are combat, combat support, and combat service support. The asterisks (*) indicate that 50% or more of the respondents in that sub-category rated those topics as very or extremely useful.

Tables 12, 13, 14, 15, 16 present the data by the respondents' "Current Job Assignment:" Command, Staff, Education/Training or Other positions; "Branch of Service:" Combat, Combat Support or Combat Service Support; "Academic Year at USAWC:" 1983, 1984, 1985, 1986, 1987; "Resident vs. Corresponding Studies Courses of Instruction;" and "Current Level of Assignment:" Department, Joint, Headquarters, Allied, MACOM Hq, Major Support Command (MSC), Brigade (BDE), and Other.

TABLE 12

USAWC TOPICS RATED AS VERY-EXTREMELY HELPFUL
BY OVER 50% OF OFFICERS IN EACH CATEGORY: CURRENT JOB ASSIGNMENT

LEAD OTHER PROFESSIONALS	C	S	E/T	O
10. Major issues in leading the Army.	*	*	*	*
11. Principles/techniques of the sr. leader.	*		*	*
12. Assessing your general health & fitness.	*	*	*	*
13. Physical fitness related to unit effectiveness.	*			*
14. Organization & functions of nonmilitary agencies.				
15. Application of word processing/automation/computer.				

WORK IN STRATEGIC ENVIRONMENTS	C	S	E/T	O
16. Formulating military/national security strategy.	*	*	*	*
17. Strategy & development of force structure.			*	*
18. Soviet economic, political, & foreign policies.				*
19. Working of the global economy.				
20. Functioning of U.S. economy & foreign policy.				
21. Terrorism in today's global environment.				
22. Military history--lessons learned.	*	*	*	*
23. Effective oral and written communication.	*	*	*	*
24. Practical briefing techniques.	*	*		

SERVE IN JOINT AND COMBINED COMMANDS	C	S	E/T	O
25. ALB doctrine & applications.		*		
26. Space as a potential military environment.				
27. Capabilities & effects of Army weapon systems.				
28. Reorganization of JCS on planning, doctrine, & execution.			*	
29. NATO organization, doctrine, & operations.				
30. DOD roles, mission, & doctrine.		*	*	*
31. U.S. Army roles, mission, & doctrine.			*	*
32. U.S. Navy roles, mission, & doctrine.				
33. U.S. Air Force roles, mission, & doctrine.				
34. U.S. Marine Corps roles, mission, & doctrine.				
35. Formulating joint military doctrine.				

DIRECT ARMY AND DOD SYSTEMS	C	S	E/T	O
36. Planning, programming, & budgeting system.	*	*	*	*
37. How Army resources, sustains, & mobilizes forces.	*	*	*	*
38. Managing & developing the Army's Management Systems.	*	*	*	

COMMAND AT THE OPERATIONAL LEVEL	C	S	E/T	O
39. Impact of technology on modern warfare.				
40. Analysis rear area doctrine & battle.				
41. Joint strategic & operational planning.			*	
42. Study & impact of low intensity conflict.				

PLAN/OPERATE THEATER/GLOBAL FORCES	C	S	E/T	O
43. Campaign planning at Unified Command level.			*	
44. Strategic & operational level decisionmaking.			*	
45. Analysis of U.S. military strategy.	*	*	*	*
46. Soviet Armed Forces: doctrine, operations, & capabilities.			*	

C=Command   S=Staff   E/T=Educ/Tng   O=Other

LEAD OTHER PROFESSIONALS	C	CS	CSS
10. Major issues in leading the Army.	*	*	*
11. Principles/techniques of the sr. leader.	*	*	*
12. Assessing your general health & fitness.	*	*	*
13. Physical fitness related to unit effectiveness.	*		*
14. Organization & functions of nonmilitary agencies.			
15. Application of word processing/automation/computer.			

WORK IN STRATEGIC ENVIRONMENTS			
16. Formulating military/national security strategy.	*	*	*
17. Strategy & development of force structure.	*	*	*
18. Soviet economic, political, & foreign policies.			
19. Working of the global economy.			
20. Functioning of U.S. economy & foreign policy.			*
21. Terrorism in today's global environment.			*
22. Military history--lessons learned.	*		*
23. Effective oral and written communication.	*	*	*
24. Practical briefing techniques.		*	*

SERVE IN JOINT AND COMBINED COMMANDS			
25. ALB doctrine & applications.	*		
26. Space as a potential military environment.			
27. Capabilities & effects of Army weapon systems.			
28. Reorganization of JCS on planning, doctrine, & execution.			
29. NATO organization, doctrine, & operations.			
30. DOD roles, mission, & doctrine.		*	*
31. U.S. Army roles, mission, & doctrine.	*	*	*
32. U.S. Navy roles, mission, & doctrine.			
33. U.S. Air Force roles, mission, & doctrine.			
34. U.S. Marine Corps roles, mission, & doctrine.			
35. Formulating joint military doctrine.			

DIRECT ARMY AND DOD SYSTEMS			
36. Planning, programming, & budgeting system.	*	*	*
37. How Army resources, sustains, & mobilizes forces.	*	*	*
38. Managing & developing the Army's Management Systems.			*

COMMAND AT THE OPERATIONAL LEVEL			
39. Impact of technology on modern warfare.			
40. Analysis rear area doctrine & battle.			
41. Joint strategic & operational planning.			
42. Study & impact of low intensity conflict.			

PLAN/OPERATE THEATER/GLOBAL FORCES			
43. Campaign planning at Unified Command level.			
44. Strategic & operational level decisionmaking.			
45. Analysis of U.S. military strategy.	*	*	*
46. Soviet Armed Forces: doctrine, operations, & capabilities.			

C=Combat   CS=Combat Support   CSS=Combat Service Support

LEAD OTHER PROFESSIONALS	87	86	85	84	83
10. Major issues in leading the Army.	*	*	*	*	*
11. Principles/techniques of the sr. leader.	*	*	*	*	*
12. Assessing your general health & fitness.	*	*	*	*	*
13. Physical fitness related to unit effectiveness.	*		*	*	*
14. Organization & functions of nonmilitary agencies.					
15. Application of word processing/automation/computer.					

WORK IN STRATEGIC ENVIRONMENTS	87	86	85	84	83
16. Formulating U.S. military & national security strategy.	*	*	*	*	*
17. Strategy & development of force structure.		*	*	*	
18. Soviet economic, political, & foreign policies.		*		*	
19. Working of the global economy.					
20. Functioning of U.S. economy & foreign policy.		*		*	
21. Terrorism in today's global environment.					
22. Military history--lessons learned.	*	*	*	*	
23. Effective oral and written communication.	*	*	*	*	*
24. Practical briefing techniques.	*			*	*

SERVE IN JOINT AND COMBINED COMMANDS	87	86	85	84	83
25. ALB doctrine & applications.		*			
26. Space as a potential military environment.					
27. Capabilities & effects of Army weapon systems.					
28. Reorganization of JCS on planning, doctrine, & execution.					
29. NATO organization, doctrine, & operations.					
30. DOD roles, mission, & doctrine.		*	*		
31. U.S. Army roles, mission, & doctrine.	*	*	*	*	*
32. U.S. Navy roles, mission, & doctrine.					
33. U.S. Air Force roles, mission, & doctrine.					
34. U.S. Marine Corps roles, mission, & doctrine.					
35. Formulating joint military doctrine.					

DIRECT ARMY AND DOD SYSTEMS	87	86	85	84	83
36. Planning, programming, & budgeting system.	*	*	*	*	*
37. How Army resources, sustains, & mobilizes forces.	*	*	*	*	*
38. Managing & developing the Army's Management Systems.	*	*		*	

COMMAND AT THE OPERATIONAL LEVEL	87	86	85	84	83
39. Impact of technology on modern warfare.		*			
40. Analysis rear area doctrine & battle.					
41. Joint strategic & operational planning.		*	*		
42. Study & impact of low intensity conflict.					

PLAN/OPERATE THEATER/GLOBAL FORCES	87	86	85	84	83
43. Campaign planning at Unified Command level.					
44. Strategic & operational level decisionmaking.	*				
45. Analysis of U.S. military strategy.		*	*	*	*
46. Soviet Armed Forces: doctrine, operations, & capabilities.		*		*	

	RESIDENT	CORRESPONDENCE

LEAD OTHER PROFESSIONALS

		RESIDENT	CORRESPONDENCE
10.	Major issues in leading the Army.	*	
11.	Principles/techniques of the sr. leader.	*	
12.	Assessing your general health & fitness.	*	
13.	Physical fitness related to unit effectiveness.	*	
14.	Organization & functions of nonmilitary agencies.		
15.	Application of word processing/automation/computer.		

WORK IN STRATEGIC ENVIRONMENTS

		RESIDENT	CORRESPONDENCE
16.	Formulating U.S. military & national security strategy.	*	*
17.	Strategy & development of force structure.	*	*
18.	Soviet economic, political, & foreign policies.		*
19.	Working of the global economy.		
20.	Functioning of U.S. economy & foreign policy.		*
21.	Terrorism in today's global environment.		
22.	Military history--lessons learned.	*	
23.	Effective oral and written communication.	*	*
24.	Practical briefing techniques.	*	*

SERVE IN JOINT AND COMBINED COMMANDS

		RESIDENT	CORRESPONDENCE
25.	ALB doctrine & applications.		
26.	Space as a potential military environment.		
27.	Capabilities & effects of Army weapon systems.		
28.	Reorganization of JCS on planning, doctrine, & execution.		
29.	NATO organization, doctrine, & operations.		
30.	DOD roles, mission, & doctrine.		*
31.	U.S. Army roles, mission, & doctrine.		*
32.	U.S. Navy roles, mission, & doctrine.		
33.	U.S. Air Force roles, mission, & doctrine.		
34.	U.S. Marine Corps roles, mission, & doctrine.		
35.	Formulating joint military doctrine.		

DIRECT ARMY AND DOD SYSTEMS

		RESIDENT	CORRESPONDENCE
36.	Planning, programming, & budgeting system.	*	*
37.	How Army resources, sustains, & mobilizes forces.	*	*
38.	Managing & developing the Army's Management Systems.	*	

COMMAND AT THE OPERATIONAL LEVEL

		RESIDENT	CORRESPONDENCE
39.	Impact of technology on modern warfare.		
40.	Analysis rear area doctrine & battle.		
41.	Joint strategic & operational planning.		
42.	Study & impact of low intensity conflict.		

PLAN/OPERATE THEATER/GLOBAL FORCES

		RESIDENT	CORRESPONDENCE
43.	Campaign planning at Unified Command level.		
44.	Strategic & operational level decisionmaking.		
45.	Analysis of U.S. military strategy.	*	*
46.	Soviet Armed Forces: doctrine, operations, & capabilities.		

TABLE 10

USAWC TOPICS RATED AS VERY-EXTREMELY HELPFUL
BY OVER 50% OF OFFICERS IN EACH CATEGORY: CURRENT LEVEL OF ASSIGNMENT

LEAD OTHER PROFESSIONALS

	D	J	H	A	MH	M	B	O
10. Major issues in leading the Army.	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
11. Principles/techniques of the sr. leader.		*	*	*	*	*	*	*
12. Assessing your general health & fitness.	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
13. Physical fitness related to unit effectiveness.						*	*	*
14. Organization & functions of nonmilitary agencies.								
15. Application of word processing/automation/computer.		*						

WORK IN STRATEGIC ENVIRONMENTS

	D	J	H	A	MH	M	B	O
16. Formulating military/national security strategy.	*	*	*	*	*		*	*
17. Strategy & development of force structure.	*	*	*	*	*	*		*
18. Soviet economic, political, & foreign policies.	*	*	*					
19. Working of the global economy.	*		*					
20. Functioning of U.S. economy & foreign policy.		*	*					*
21. Terrorism in today's global environment.		*	*					*
22. Military history--lessons learned.	*	*		*	*	*	*	*
23. Effective oral and written communication.	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
24. Practical briefing techniques.	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*

SERVE IN JOINT AND COMBINED COMMANDS

	D	J	H	A	MH	M	B	O
25. ALB doctrine & applications.				*	*	*	*	
26. Space as a potential military environment.								
27. Capabilities & effects of Army weapon systems.					*			
28. Reorganization of JCS on planning, doctrine, & execution.			*		*			
29. NATO organization, doctrine, & operations.					*			
30. DOD roles, mission, & doctrine.	*	*			*			*
31. U.S. Army roles, mission, & doctrine.	*	*	*	*	*	*		*
32. U.S. Navy roles, mission, & doctrine.					*			
33. U.S. Air Force roles, mission, & doctrine.					*			
34. U.S. Marine Corps roles, mission, & doctrine.					*			
35. Formulating joint military doctrine.			*		*			

DIRECT ARMY AND DOD SYSTEMS

	D	J	H	A	MH	M	B	O
36. Planning, programming, & budgeting system.	*	*	*		*	*	*	*
37. How Army resources, sustains, & mobilizes forces.	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
38. Managing & developing the Army's Management Systems.	*		*		*	*	*	

COMMAND AT THE OPERATIONAL LEVEL

	D	J	H	A	MH	M	B	O
39. Impact of technology on modern warfare.						*		
40. Analysis rear area doctrine & battle.								
41. Joint strategic & operational planning.				*	*	*		*
42. Study & impact of low intensity conflict.					*			

PLAN/OPERATE THEATER/GLOBAL FORCES

	D	J	H	A	MH	M	B	O
43. Campaign planning at Unified Command level.				*	*			
44. Strategic & operational level decisionmaking.				*	*			*
45. Analysis of U.S. military strategy.	*	*	*	*	*	*		*
46. Soviet Armed Forces: doctrine, operations, & capabilities.					*	*		

D=Dept J=Joint H=Hdqtr A=Allied MH=MACOMHQ M=MSC B=BDE O=Other

What is striking about the data is that there is so much consensus about the usefulness of certain topics regardless of assignments (Command, Staff, Educ/Trng, Other), Year Group (AY 1983, 1984, etc.), or branch (Combat, Combat Support or Combat Service Support). The following seven topics were rated as "very useful" or "extremely useful" by over 50% of the respondents in each category above.

10. Major issues in leading the Army.
12. Assessing your general health and fitness.
16. Formulating U.S. military and national security strategy.
23. Effective oral and written communications.
31. US Army roles, mission, and doctrine.
36. The planning, programming and budgeting system.
37. How the Army resources, sustains, and mobilizes forces.

There are a few notable exceptions. For example, although Resident graduates felt that "(12) assessing your general health and fitness" was very useful, the Corresponding Course graduates did not rate it as highly. This probably reflects the lack of a specific block of instruction for the Corresponding students rather than a lack of usefulness. Over 15% of the Corresponding students responded that this topic did not apply to them or that they didn't remember the topic from USAWC as compared to less than 2% of the Resident students.

The variable assessing the graduates' current level of assignment (i.e., Department of Army, Joint, Allied, MACOM HQ, MSC, Brigade or Other) is of interest in identifying utilities of specific study topics. As can be seen in the following table, graduates currently in an Allied Commands, and to a slightly lesser degree in Joint Commands, found more topics to be very to extremely useful in their assignments. This reflects the breadthand enormous span of issues with which they work. Twenty-eight topics were rated very to extremely useful by over 50% of graduates in Allied Commands, 21 topics for those in Joint Commands, as opposed to graduates in Headquarters Commands (12 topics), Department of Army (14 topics), Major Command HQ or Brigade (13 topics). The topics under "work in strategic environments" and "serv(ing) in joint and combined commands" were very useful to those serving in Allied Commands, as would be expected. Interestingly, though, topics under "serv(ing) in joint and combined commands" were not as useful to those in Joint Commands.

There were very few topics that were not rated as very useful by at least one sub-group of officers. It appears that all the courses taught at the War College were useful to at least some officers. For those few topics that were viewed as less useful, it is unclear whether this indicates that these were not offered at the War College during their tenure, were offered and are not useful, or were offered and the instruction was not

adequate. Several of these topics, though, were mentioned in the narrative section as subjects that should be added to the curriculum, and will be discussed later.

Narrative data

In addition to the "numbers" data, respondents were asked to provide information on several questions. The graduates were asked to identify the "most helpful topic," what subjects should be added to the curriculum, what subjects to delete from the curriculum, and general comments. These narratives provide the respondents an opportunity to identify specific topics that were most and least helpful, and to provide information on same.

These narrative answers were collated by year group. A compilation of all the narratives can be found in DAA (Rm. A118). A summary of these data will be presented here by question. These comments provide insight and help put the data into context.

Which of the Themes and Topics Have Been Most Helpful
to You in Your Present Assignment? Please Explain.

Far and away the two most frequently cited as helpful themes were (1) Direct Army/DoD Systems--including PPBS and how the Army runs, and (2) Lead Other Professionals. This was true for every year group (AY 1983 to 1987). Some other frequently mentioned themes were "working in the strategic environment," "command at the operational level," "serving in joint/combined command," "health and fitness," and "joint operations."

> "Lead Other Professionals--As a new bde level cdr it is hard to let LTCs (Bn level cdrs) do their jobs (day to day) and you focus out into the future in order to develop your vision of what you want the unit to look like 2 yrs from now. The courses in this block of instruction helped me learn about myself and leadership style. These courses gave me the tools to be able to articulate my leadership style to subordinates, provide guidance and then focus on the big picture."

> "PPBES: At the corps/HQ/installation level, nearly all decisions are based on dollars available. Understanding how the PPBES works is a necessity."

> "How the Army works. Although tedious, complicated, ambiguous, it really is important once one gives up his battalion."

"Work in strategic environments and Direct Army and DOD systems because the former drives the latter and I work everyday with the latter."

"Command at operational level--gave me an in-depth perspective of how the leadership operates and how the subordinate units help accomplish such operational concepts."

But it appears that almost every topic that is taught at USAWC has been "most helpful" to at least some students. Perceived "helpfulness" is very much dependent on the position the officer holds. Hence, every topic listed from 'space as a potential military environment' and 'AirLand Battle' to 'automation and word processing' and 'oral and written communications' to 'plan/operate theatre/global forces', military history, NATO, dealing with civilian personnel, 'ethics', 'low intensity conflict', to the 'impact of the Goldwater-Nichols JCS reorganization' were perceived by at least some officers as most helpful in their positions.

"Use of the computers, strange enough. We are going high tech and a working knowledge of how to use computers as a direct source of info not as management tool as I did in past. Future leaders/managers are going to have to be computer literate."

"Effective oral & written communication; constant requirements both written decision papers and decision briefings."

"Serve in a joint and combined command. The appreciation of other services and the roles they play formulating joint doctrine helped me tremendously."

"Health and fitness--issue is beneficial to one's well being regardless of assignment."

Courses and activities not listed in the questionnaire were also mentioned. Some of these include: "Contemporary Command," "Listening to Our Critics: The Challenge of the Military Reform Movement," "Research, Development and Acquisition Management" to having "time to think and reflect," "AF, Navy electives and trip to Norfolk" and "requirement to write a paper on command philosophy." A few even stated that all of the courses or none of the courses were helpful. Two graduates wrote the following:

"This question reveals the problem. The War College is a total experience not a theme or topic. You become a more aware professional soldier as a result of the experience. The War College should not be a graduate

level CAS3. Senior officers are thinkers who need time to
reflect and read a variety of writings. Less themes/
topics and more library time where officers could
undertake study projects of their choosing."

"As a general statement, all of the subjects added
to a better professional understanding of our tasks in the
defense of freedom...in command that is important. There
is no single topic that stands out."

"None--the curriculum when I attended (AY 1983)
had zero focus on Bde level operations."

**If You Could Add Any One Subject to the Curriculum,
What Would That Subject Be? Please Explain.**

It is interesting to note that the single, most frequent
answer to this question is "none". Many graduates were very
satisfied with the curriculum they received and suggested that no
new courses be added. This did not appear to differ across year
groups. In other words, it made no difference between those who
recently attended the USAWC or earlier graduates (taking into
account that the most recent graduate was one year out of USAWC
to the least recent at six years out).

In addition, a wide range of topics was suggested for
consideration or inclusion in the USAWC curriculum. There seemed
to be no consensus among the graduates for additions. In other
words, each graduate had his own ideas about how to improve the
curriculum. Some such as making Advanced Warfighting and
physical fitness courses mandatory; increasing studies on Joint
and Combined operations, PPBS, military history, global strategy;
and "less core and more advance courses"--are modifications to
the curriculum rather than additions.

Others are "new" and may warrant consideration. These are
"new" in the sense that, although aspects may be presented in
conjunction with current courses, there are no specific courses
devoted to these topics. A few suggestions for "new" courses are
presented here: decisionmaking, how to deal with the bureaucracy
(other general officers, Congress, the media, etc.), automatic
data processing, PSYOPs and special operations, procurement and
contracting, and managing/dealing with change. Sports Day, which
was discontinued a year ago, was suggested for re-introduction.

"'How to get along in a bureaucratic Washington.'
I realize this is in part of how the Army runs and I know
we are all warfighters but if unsuccessful in bureaucratic
we will not have adequate people or equipment..."

"Decisionmaking--while covered or touched upon in many areas it needs more emphasis. War College graduates shape the decisions of DOD in varying degrees for years after they graduate..."

"Automation Management! The subject was not covered in any detail in the seminar rooms. We, the Army, are in the dark ages in this area; maybe not at the DOD/DA level, but in the field, at the schools, at the installation, in the tactical units, this is a reality. Decreasing personnel strength and a constrained budget dictate that we do things smarter, quicker and manage better. Automation will enable us to do this. Regretably, few of us know what we need to assess needs, direct/manage development of automation systems, networks or architectures. Rather than offering automation as an elective, incorporate it into the core curriculum."

As the USAWC curriculum is constantly evolving, with significant changes made every year, graduates may not know the current curriculum and so may be unaware that they already exist. It appears that some of these subjects suggested for inclusion are already offered in advanced courses or have been included in the core courses. Hence, although the students were asked to identify new subjects to add to the curriculum, some of their comments focused on re-allocation of time and amount of emphasis on current (already on the curriculum) topics. For example, civilian personnel management, something that was not offered in AY83 and identified by some AY83 alumni as needed, was offered in AY86 and AY87.

**If You Could Drop Any One Subject From the List,
What Would That Subject Be? Please Explain.**

As with the previous question, the students' most frequent response was "none." Most students were of the opinion that all subjects taught at the USAWC were of value to their professional development, although not always directly applicable to their present position. Some graduates took a longer view of what would be useful to include future assignments. This attitude is summed up in the following verbatim comments.

"All have had a positive impact and are necessary to make a whole picture without a piece missing."

"I've tried for 15 minutes to decide what to drop and all courses covered have affected me positively. In looking at the subjects which I rated lowest as they benefit my current job, I still would not like any of them deleted."

"I do not remember anything that could not be beneficial in overall senior leadership development. Many of the specific areas covered may not be things I will be directly involved with but they may be important to an overall understanding of what is going on around me."

"...it would be inappropriate to say I did not need something in my present job when it could be valuable knowledge in several years."

Most of the changes were suggestions for reallocation of time from "less important" to "more important" subjects, as noted in the following comment: "I think you should keep them all. I would spend less time on some and more on others." Suggestions for less time on the curriculum included "touchy/feely stuff in Course 1," physical fitness, Type A and family health, space, Army and DoD systems, "budget process should be an elective," "writing ops orders" (only in 1987 class), military history. Again, there was no consensus among the graduates on which topics should be accorded less time and emphasis. Each seemed to have his own agenda based on his current assignment.

Deletion vs. Addition of Courses

Many of these suggestions for deletion appear to contradict the earlier additions to the curriculum. In previous sections, these same subjects were seen by other students as the most valuable courses they had or were suggested for additional time. For some students, for example, the courses on stress management/Type A, PPBS, etc. were the most valuable. For others, these courses were seen as prime candidates for deletion.

There are several possible explanations for the data for this seeming inconsistency. First, the curricular needs of the individuals may differ significantly. Someone who knows the topic may feel that less time should be devoted to it while novices may feel the need for more time. The following comments are indicative of the feelings of students who have a mastery of certain topics:

"decrease the podium time given to physical fitness. We believe--just go and do--no need for browbeating repeatedly from the podium."

"If senior leaders are not aware of their's and other's general health/physical fitness, it is too late to change them."

"The touchy-feely--ENTJ identity crap--by the time a person is 40 years old and been a commander etc., he understands who and what his style and temperament is."

Second, although the topic may be very useful, the presentation of course material may not be palatable, leaving the student with the feeling that his time was not optimally used. This may have led the graduate to feel less time could have been spent on that particular topic.

"Direct Army and DOD systems should, if not dropped, be modified in some way so as to make the theme more palatable. Granted the theme is important; the topics could be integrated into other courses. For many, the rigor of the courses of instruction within this theme seems to far outweigh the usefulness of the knowledge. For those who do not have an early follow on assignment dealing in direction of Army or DOD systems, the knowledge is not used and is too quickly out of date to be much use in later assignments."

"PPBES needs to be examined but not along the lines it was presented last year (AY 1987). While an inherently complex subject, it should be taught in increments with practical, realistic exercises. Lump sum instruction on PPBES is a non-starter and considering its importance, we need to do a better job on how its presented."

However, it should be noted that not all students equate palatability with utility. As the previous quote indicated, while the students disliked the PPBS course, and thought it was a waste of time while at USAWC (as indicated on course evaluations), once they are operating in the real world, they feel they haven't got enough information about PPBS, and would like more. Undoubtedly, PPBS is an onerous course to go through, but one of the most useful topics once the graduates are back in the field. It is probably very sobering to find that all requirements equate to resources, and the only way to successfully procure resources to meet requirements is by understanding and effectively using the system.

Two additional examples show that graduates are able to distinguish between palatability and utility for some other courses.

"For me command at the operation level. I have nor will I have any use for the time spent. If I were running the college you bet I'd keep it going and I'd keep me in it like it or not."

"Joint and combined commands and Army and DoD systems. I'm serving my second tour in OSD (force management). In retrospect, the dullest, least intellectually challenging or fun part of the course, was probably the most valuable and directly relevant to what I do now."

Third, the graduates' suggestions may reflect the changing world situation. Certain topics may have less relevance for today and the future than they did previously. If this is true, these would be candidates for deletion, or at least, a reduction in course time. For example,

> "NATO. Still with us, but not for much longer. Should be an elective for those who wish to specialize in European relations/military history."

> "I would not drop, but would de-emphasize NATO. I believe we have over emphasized Europe to the detriment of our policy in the third world. The north-south issues facing the free world make it likely that major future confrontations and competition between east and west will take place in the developing nations of Africa, Asia, Mid-east and Latin America."

> "Not drop, but 'tone back' some of the emphasis on Clausewitz. He's an interesting study and his princi-pals (sp) are nearly universal--but it would have been good to study some of the soviet leaders....the one's (sp) whose principals (sp) the Soviet war machine will use to fight by."

Fourth, some graduates see a disconnect between what is taught at the USAWC and the reality. In such situations, it is not difficult to see why graduates may suggest incongruities to be eliminated, as evidenced in the next two comments:

> "How the Army runs-mgt systems, those interminable charts of systems and subsystems that look good on paper but are shambles in execution--on the E-ring and at every intervening level down to division. Don't waste the time."

> "Principles and techniques of the senior leader-- fantasy land. More phonies out there at that level than anywhere else. Talk vs. action--little integrity."

Fifth, certain topics may not be useful for the majority of the graduates. The USAWC has as its mission, the capstone education for the Army's officers. As such, the educational focus must be on producing O-6 to O-10 level officers. The courses offered, then, must cover the skills and knowledges required over this broad spectrum. However, as only one-seventh of AWC graduates will achieve the ranks of Flag Officer ranks (although nearly 98% of all Army generals are USAWC graduates), some of the skills taught may not be applicable to the remaining six-sevenths who will perform at the O-6 level.

"National strategy--less focus at this level. Get down to running the Army, maintaining its readiness, and taking it to war. Only a select few actually will work in the national policy arena; too lofty for my class. Need to learn how to be good O6's."

"I believe someone needs to look at where MEL-1's go serve and structure the course to meet these needs. Someone should review what jobs require MEL-1. Too much emphasis is placed on the strategic/national level when in reality most MEL-1's will never work there. The operational level/MACOM level is where the emphasis needs to be."

Sixth, some graduates may have been considering other positions they may have held or potentially will hold in contrast to the skills they need in their current positions. In addition, there are skills that may not be specifically useful to their position, but are important for overall professional development. The following comments are indicative of this attitude.

"It depends upon follow-on assignments."

"None--low ranking of several themes/subjects relates to importance to my assignments. All topics improved my overall professional officer skills. Assignment will dictate direct job application. This should not be a goal. SSC should be like a liberal arts undergrad education i.e. prepare an officer to senior leadership roles with increasing responsibility. SSC should not attempt to prepare an officer for a specific assignment."

Please Give Us Any Personal Comments or Suggestions About Your Overall War College Experience. For Example, Did the USAWC Provide a Challenging and Worthwhile Experience for You?

There were literally hundreds of comments sent in response to this question. Although all of the comments are valuable, space considerations prevent us from presenting them all here. Instead, several of the more frequently cited issues relevant to the purposes of this report are presented here. The complete transcription of comments can be obtained from USAWC.

Several general topics surfaced in response to this question: the value of USAWC, the students and rigor, suggestions for outreach programs, the value of MEL-1 education, and the current emphasis on jointness. There were numerous comments on each one of the topics.

Only a few positive and negative comments can be presented in this paper. As stated above, the comments are representative of the range from positive to negative. They are not intended to represent the graduates proportionately. That is, one positive and one negative comment on the same topic does NOT indicate that 50% of the responses were positive and 50% negative. It is merely to give the reader a flavor of the responses.

Due to the lack of space, only a few positive and negative comments will be presented on any topic. As there are many more positive than negative comments, presenting even one negative comment to five positive comments will be overrepresenting the negative. Therefore the comments should not be seen as representative of the graduates, but rather representative of each side of the issue. The intent is to provide a flavor of opinions in the graduates' "own voice."

Value of USAWC

The graduates found their year at USAWC challenging and worthwhile--professionally and personally. Each student found a different aspect of the total experience most significant. For some, the ability to "mix and match" courses and activities to their own needs was most important. As two graduates wrote:

> "A super experience! Please never forget that each student is unique! Accordingly, you must leave enough flexibility in the course for the indiv to develop. A set course with a 'cookie cutter' formula will be counter productive."

> "A very worthwhile experience which allowed me to focus on those areas that I was weak in. I still have a long ways to go but I am armed with the right tools to be analytical and apply the correct leadership techniques to get the job done."

Some felt they grew intellectually through the core and advanced courses and interaction with peers and International Fellows. Others focused on growth or improvement physically (with the Type A and physical fitness programs), professionally (through networking with other senior officers and the International Fellows), and as a whole person (family renewal programs and time). Many felt that it was the total experience: the combination was everything.

> "The USAWC was the highlight of my educational experiences. It was an exceptional opportunity to grow professionally, personally and to reflect on the broader issues of our profession. It broadened my understanding of myself, my fellow soldiers and the Army. It was a unique and invaluable experience."

"The War College is a total experience not a theme or topic. You become a more aware professional soldier as a result of the experience."

The social and professional interaction with peers was mentioned frequently as an unintended benefit for the graduate and the Army. The value of networking for problem solving is difficult to measure, but in a bureaucratic environment it can cut much "red tape" and save time and aggravation in working a problem. The value of this interaction is exemplified in the following comment:

"Finally, the friends and acquaintances made at the USAWC were priceless. For example, at least on a weekly basis I have contacted one or more of these peers in the resolution of issues/requirements at my current job."

Even for those few who were disappointed with the curriculum, there was value in USAWC. "We all know it's not challenging. It was worthwhile personally--a joke professionally." Although that student did not integrate his personal growth into his professional development, others were able to do that, as the following comment describes:

"The resident year did not provide a host of invaluable tools for use as a medical center commander. It did offer me something far more important. The focus on ethical issues, history and personal obligations, coupled with time for reading, introspection, reflection, and dialogue with some of the brightest officers in the military, has helped me immeasurably in my growth as a person. So it helped me become a far better commander than a bag of tricks could ever have offered."

Students and Rigor

Each year, the Resident student selection is less than 5% of the eligible officers. These students have proven themselves time and again during their 20+ years of service. Although there are a few exceptions, the majority were judged by their peers to be motivated and achievement oriented. Hence, rigor was perceived to be institutionalized through the selection process.

"Since those selected to attend are the Army's best, they do not need motivation, just a good environment and quality faculty to get material/information to them effectively."

"Given that environment, if the students don't challenge and better themselves, then we're picking the wrong students."

Rigor, at the USAWC, is imposed to establish an acceptable standard of educational performance. This seeks to evaluate the student against a standard rather than against every other student. It seeks to motivate the student to learn as much as possible in a short time by setting an educational goal level. It does not seek to motivate a student by fear of failure, but by appealing to his need for educational achievement. As one student succinctly stated:

> "I did not want the USAWC to be challenging. I wanted it to be educational. My last 12 years have been challenging and stressful. I can learn without being challenged."

> "It was the first (and last) Army school at which I was treated as an adult commensurate with my rank. The noncompetitive environment stimulated me to reach out into areas of interest to me, explore and research them in depth and do so because I wanted to not because I had to."

Rigor can be imposed on the system in several ways: the most frequently suggested is a system of testing, grading and rank ordering by merit--as is done at the United States Military Academy (USMA) or Command and General Staff College (CGSC). This system pits one student against another in a competitive environment. Grading is accomplished on the "curve" or distribution of scores.

A second method would be to increase the requirements (papers, oral presentations, and preparatory work) and impose a standard of performance. In this system, students would be working to achieve a standard, pitting the student against the standard. By having an external standard of performance, a student's goal is to meet or exceed the standard, not to compete against another student.

Most graduates felt that there was sufficient academic rigor at the USAWC. Rigor, for the most part, was self-imposed. That is, students felt that they were responsible for their own conduct and performance. Hence, they did not feel that they needed rigor imposed by external standards.

There were, however, a sizable number who felt that more rigor could have been imposed upon themselves and other students. This rigor was in the form of additional requirements rather than a formal system of testing and grading. Frequent suggestions were increasing the reading, writing or preparatory requirements.

> "No tests, but increased research, writing, formal presentations."

"More emphasis should be placed on academic
performance by students--not tests--but prior class
preparations, reading assignments etc."

Suggestions for Outreach Programs

With the recognition that the world is changing at a very
fast pace, some students have suggested various outreach programs
for them to stay abreast of current trends. These included
annual updates on key issues, post graduate courses (such as
those at CGSC), and refreshers through the use of "electronic
bulletin boards, interactive video and training discs." These
would provide new information or more in-depth information about
specific topics of concern and utility to the graduates.

Outreach programs were not just suggested to keep student
up-to-date. A few suggestions were aimed at improving the
College by instituting an annual survey of graduates and having
alumni visit the college. The annual survey would be useful in
keeping the College abreast of changes in the field, of
anticipating and pro-actively changing the curriculum to better
meet the needs of future senior officers. Alumni Day (or week)
would bring graduates back to the campus to renew old
acquaintances and generate support for the College.

Value of MEL-1 Education

Several graduates were disappointed that having a MEL-1
education did not give them enough of a distinction from their
peers or that positions classified MEL-1 do not require it.
Although this is a much more complex problem than presented here,
the number of comments would imply that a systematic study of
MEL-1 assignments may be in order.

"...led you to believe SSC selection leads to
bigger and better things, the Army personnel system places
SSC graduates in an all others category in terms of
assignment. SSC non-select group still get to be O-6's,
still get promoted early, still go to the stepping stone
jobs. Some SSC graduates go to, by comparison, mediocre
jobs. Guess my problem with SSC (MEL-1) status is that
its really a hollow achievement. If the Army continues to
select officers for O6 without SSC selection/attendance
then one has to question why the gov't should send others
off to school for a year to obtain O6."

"My greatest disappointment since graduation in '83
is the lack of assignment distinction for MEL-1 officers.
Holding MEL-1 narrows assignment windows some--several--
of which are deadend, nonproductive 'retired on active
duty' jobs. We need to do a better utilization job for
MEL-1 officers."

"Talk to TAPA about the importance of filling positions with MEL-1 06's. Every job I ever really wanted TAPA put a MEL-4 06 in the job. Look at Division Chief, DAMO-SSM. Look at Army attache Moscow, look at senior TRADOC LNO to the German Army. All key positions and no War College. What gives?"

"...our totally bankrupt personnel system failed in assigning me to a job which does not even require a COL much less a MEL1. The position will be civilianized on 1 Oct 88. By the time my 4 yr lock-in is over I will have forgotten all taught at the War College and the American tax payers money will have been wasted "

Emphasis on Joint Education

The current DoD emphasis on "jointness" led to concerns and criticisms. One graduate felt that he had jeopardized his career by coming to USAWC rather than attending another Senior Service College which is better known for its joint instruction. Another graduate, though, had a different interpretation for officers preferring the National War College (NWC) or the Industrial College of the Armed Forces (ICAF)--two institutions which are seen as the capstone for joint education. Yet, this officer's interpretation was that the choice was less for professional than for purely personal reasons.

"Please ensure that you become fully integrated into JPME. Failure to do so will take USAWC out of the mainstream of officer education."

"I feel with the present emphasis on joint duty and education I jeopardized any chance I had to make general officer by attending the Army War College."

"The career managers at TAPA will tell you, I think, that the best and brightest are clamoring for NWC and ICAF slatings so as to lock themselves into Washington for a 4 1/2 year stay while their kids finish high school, their wives sell real estate, and they follow a year at McNair with up to 3 1/2 years on the OJCS or OSD staff-- then go to a brigade."

Other officers criticized this emphasis on jointness. They felt there should be a preservation of the differences between the services. A focus on jointness, from their perspective, would lead to a diminution of service specific issues and the impression that to work in joint arenas is superior to work in Army positions.

"I think we are headed into the lapel-button-qualification mode in an attempt to belatedly qualify officers in the joint arena. That's unfortunate because

of the trade-offs in basic competence as a soldier that will have to be made. We cannot let our chosen leaders believe that it is better to work as an action officer at EUCPOM or JCS as a major or LTC than it is to lead soldiers at Graf, NTC or Ft. Bragg."

"Please resist any of the wild proposals...to mold the various war colleges into one system. The services are different with different missions. No change in this regard should be made unless all other services are willing to base their doctrine on the Army's which is the basic/fundamental service to which all other services provide support."

Corresponding Studies Program

The Corresponding Studies Course (CSC) students had some specific comments on their program and their concerns. Hence, they will be presented as a separate group in this section. Their concerns run the gamut from the Army's perception of CSC graduates (vis a vis Resident Course graduates), specific outreach programs which might benefit CSC students, and suggested changes to their curriculum.

One of the recurring themes is the disparity of work and respect between CSC and Resident course graduates. Many CSC graduates feel that they have had a much more difficult and time consuming course of study, but have not received the respect or the consideration for promotion commensurate with their efforts. Their concerns and frustrations are reflected in these few selected comments.

"CSC was the most challenging academic experience I've had in the Army. Tough to do while working full time. Mel 1 is worth it, wish selection boards shared the view that CSC is tougher than resident AWC. Pity."

"...Sadly, some 23 days after my 1986 graduation, I was informed...that I had been passed over to O6. My ego and personal esteem were shattered! Obviously two different boards appraised my potential two different ways! I had just been accepted for duty in the OJCS commencing 6 Oct 86. Why?? Note: My ORB indicated I was an AWC CSC selectee rather than a graduate."

"Unfortunately, MEL 1 means nothing if non-select to O6. Community & TAPA don't care if you are MEL 1 if you aren't O5(P) or O6. Attendees get mixed signals i.e. school selection sends message one is considered to have a good future. After a great deal of time and effort expended on the course then another signal says 'yes' but not that good i.e. for promotion. What a terrible waste of schooling and talent for the Army! Non-MEL 1's

selected for O6 and never get MEL 1. MEL 1's retire as O5's. This is OPMS? A MEL 1 who is non-select should be explained by the selection board. Bottom line - AWC is of limited value if the system doesn't support the utilization of graduates!"

"I perceive a corresponding studies grad to be a 2d class MEL-1 in the eyes of resident grads. The CSC is infintely more difficult and demanding with regard to maintaining job performance and family responsibilities."

CSC program improvement included many suggestions for increasing the length and timing of the resident phases. Many would like to see the two resident phases increased from 2 weeks to 3- 4 weeks. While it is acknowledged that this may provide more problems to RC officer students, the extended length of residency is thought to provide "more time for study group work and presentations" and "improve the curriculum to parallel, as much as possible, the resident course". Other suggestions include inviting CSC students to attend the National Security Seminar and to include a one-week resident session at the beginning of the CSC course.

Other potential program improvements include establishing more outreach programs to current students and also graduates. For example:

"It was so good, I remarked about getting updates about every other year - assuming the curriculum didn't change."

"Perhaps using video mediums versus so much emphasis on the written word would expedite coverage of the material."

"I would suggest that quarterly seminars of one or two days held at each MACOM would be beneficial. One instructor could go to Europe, Korea, Panama, Japan, etc., the students could come to the instructor to discuss issues and turn in papers. This quarterly meeting would serve to keep everyone on track and focused while allowing greater faculty interaction with the students."

"Consider electives in the corresponding studies program to allow students greater flexibility in preparing himself for future assignments in line with his experience and interests."

"It may be helpful however to encourage local study groups or lunch meetings etc. among enrollees especially

in corresponding studies. It might facilitate this process to publish the list of all corresponding studies (students), by location. This would enlarge pool to provide mutual support and encouragement."

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The first purpose of this survey was to determine whether the USAWC was adequately preparing its students for senior leadership positions. That was fully accomplished. USAWC has prepared its students well for the positions they hold.

From all the data, one can conclude that the USAWC prepared its students well for future assignments. This was true for each year group surveyed (AY 1983 to AY 1987). Depending on the assignment, different topics in the curriculum had more relevance and utility than others. With the great diversity of jobs that USAWC graduates are assigned, it is not surprising that every topic listed was rated to be very helpful by at least a small group of graduates. This lends great credence to the USAWC policy of providing a few general core courses with many specialized advanced courses. Those topics with the greatest applicability should be included in the core courses and topics applicable to a smaller number of officers should be covered in the elective advanced courses.

There was no consensus about what should be added or eliminated from the curriculum. For every suggestion that a specific subject should be shortened or eliminated, there was an equally compelling argument for increasing the depth or length of the course. If there was something seriously wrong with the curriulum, more agreement would have been expected.

Some "new" courses suggested--by earlier graduates--for inclusion, are part of the more recent curriculum. For example, civilian personnel management (as distinct from personnel management) was not taught in AY 1983. As more Army positions became civilianized, it became evident to the faculty that a course addressing specific civilian personnel issues was required, and civilian personnel management as an advanced course was incorporated into the curriculum. The military family is another advanced course that was added in AY 1985 in response to the Chief of Staff's White Paper recognizing Army family contributions, needs and requirements.

The second purpose--to prepare the College for future trends and (to revise the curriculum to meet) long term educational objectives, was not completely addressed. Graduates were asked to identify new or additional subjects to add to the curriculum but their focus was on needs identified in their

current position.   This would identify some of the future
requirements, but may not be representative of all the skills
needed in positions filled by USAWC graduates.

While the data are very important in determining the
utility of USWAC courses right now--it is a snapshot based on
specific positions at one time, and its utility is limited on the
following characteristics. It is position dependent, and there
is no way to verify that this is representative of all the USAWC
graduates. Second, it is time and AY dependent. By identifying
current USAWC courses rather than generic skills or topics,
students from academic years when these courses were not offered
cannot realistically rate them.

Third, this is only one perspective of USAWC curriculum.
Comparable information from other sources are not available to
validate this data. Information will be needed from faculty
members, from superiors of the officers, from other senior
service schools, and from personnel planners to accurately assess
(and to put into a balanced perspective) information comparing
USAWC curriculum to other curricula, identifying needs of future
senior officers, etc.

Fourth, this is an assessment of the courses that were
offered, not a forward look to what is needed in the future. As
an assessment of current USAWC programs, the survey gives little
information about how to improve the current curriculum with the
deletion or addition of academic topics. It is possible that
USAWC is doing just a super job of preparing students, that no
substantive changes are necessary. However, that, too, would
have to be validated.

The problem can be likened to trying to hit two moving
target with the same bullet. Both the graduates and the USAWC
curriculum are evolving. As graduates mature and are reassigned
to positions and levels of positions (i.e., from brigade to MACOM
HQ to Department of Army to Department of Defense), different
topics take on more relevance or salience. At the same time, the
USAWC curriculum is changing as the faculty and course directors
change. Hence, the graduates are constantly responding to the
old curriculum which may not have much similarity to the current
curriculum.

While it is neither feasible nor desirable to keep the
curriculum constant (for the purposes of evaluation), it is
possible to follow the same graduates as they develop. This
would mean that at least one variable (graduates) would stay
constant. As the graduates continue in their careers, it is
anticipated that a proportion of them will be going into almost
every position available. Latest statistics indicate that about
one-seventh of all USAWC graduates will become flag officers
(although 98% of all Army flag officers are USAWC graduates).By
employing a longitudinal technique to track and survey graduates,

one can identify topics that are of import to each position. In other words, the identification of important topics will not be dependent upon the interaction of person by position. Topics and skill needed for each position can be identified independent of the specific graduate.

An annual or biennial survey of these graduates and all succeeding graduates is needed looking at the skills and topics that are currently useful in their jobs, other skills used in other jobs, and a look into proposed future requirements and needs. Graduates must be asked to focus on their current positions with a view to changes they anticipate in the next three to ten years and the additional skills and content knowledge their successors will need.

In addition to the above survey, information from sources other than the graduates is needed. As indicated above, utility of topics and effectiveness of learning these topics must also be rated by the senior officer graduates' supervisors, by USAWC faculty, and also by graduates who have left the Army (for whatever reason). Comparative data on utilization of USAWC MEL-1 graduates vs all other MEL-1's will have to be gathered from other senior service schools and from personnel assignment officers. And finally, input from the futures planners and programmers, the very highest senior officers (O-8 through O-10's) of the Army and the other services will be required to provide a futures orientation and projection of senior officer needs and requirements into the next two decades. All of this information will have to be gathered on a periodic basis if the USAWC is to be proactive in the world of senior officer education.

REFERENCES

Curriculum Pamphlet: Academic Year 1983. Carlisle, PA: U.S.
    Army War College.

Curriculum Pamphlet: Academic Year 1984. Carlisle, PA: U.S.
    Army War College.

Curriculum Pamphlet: Academic Year 1985. Carlisle, PA: U.S.
    Army War College.

Curriculum Pamphlet: Academic Year 1986. Carlisle, PA: U.S.
    Army War College.

Curriculum Pamphlet: Academic Year 1987. Carlisle, PA: U.S.
    Army War College.

Dougherty, R. E., Shutler, P. D., Bayne, M. G., Smith, D. C.
    (1987). The Report of the Senior Military Schools Review Board
    on Recommendations to the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff
    Regarding Professional Military Education in Joint Matters.
    Washington, D.C.: Pentagon (May 7, 1987).

Halloran, R. (1988). Troubling Ratings on Military Education at
    Top. The New York Times, September 19, 1988.

Murray, W. (1986/7). Grading the War Colleges. The National
    Interest, Winter, 12-19.

Rostow, E. V. and Endicott, J. E. (1987). The Teaching of
    Strategy and Foreign Policy at the Senior War Colleges: A
    Personal Assessment. Washington, D.C.: National Defense
    University.

Skelton Commission (1988). Hearing on Professional Military
    Education. Washington, D.C.: Panel on Military Education,
    Committee on Armed Services.

U.S. ARMY WAR COLLEGE
SURVEY

WINTER 1988

REPLY TO
ATTENTION OF

AWCA

21 January 1993

MEMORANDUM FOR: Survey Participants

SUBJECT: U.S. Army War College Survey

1. The purpose of this survey is to determine if the U.S. Army War College (USAWC) is fulfilling its primary mission to educate and prepare students for senior leadership positions. As a graduate of USAWC, your assistance is requested to ensure that the College is meeting the educational needs of today's Army leaders. It is important that we have your personal views and experiences on the usefulness of the topics covered at the War College.

2. The survey will be used to gather information to evaluate the relevancy of the current War College curriculum in accomplishing its mission as well as to properly prepare the College for future trends and long term educational objectives. Since information from this survey will be used as one source of input during the long term planning and development of the War College curriculum, the impact of the survey may not be seen for several years. I assure you the information is needed and will be used by the College.

3. The suspense is 7 days upon receipt of this document. If you have any questions, please contact Colonel Davis AUTOVON 242-4007. I appreciate the time and interest you are taking to pass on to us your personal views. Thank you for your cooperation.

HOWARD D. GRAVES
Major General, USA
Commandant

INSTRUCTIONS

1.   Indicate all answers on the questionnaire by circling the number of your response.

2.   Select only ONE answer to each question.

3.   If you make a mistake, erase the mark completely before entering a new answer.

4.   Your survey questionnaire will be treated as confidential. Only persons involved in preparing the information for analysis will have access to it.   Only group statistics will be reported.

5.   If there is a question that you find objectionable, you are not required to answer it.   Leave that answer space blank and go on to the next question.

8.   Upon completion of survey, please return the questionnaire in the self-addressed envelope provided.

Background Questions

1. What is your current grade?

   1. LTC
   2. LTC (P)
   3. COL
   4. COL (P)
   5. BG

2. What is your component?

   1. Active Army
   2. Army National Guard
   3. Army Reserves

3. What is your sex?

   1. Male
   2. Female

4. What is the level of your current assignment?

   1. Departmental (Sec Army, OSD, etc.)
   2. Joint Staff (OJCS, CINCPAC, REDCOM, etc.)
   3. Military Service Headquarters (CSA, DCSOPS, DCSLOG, etc.)
   4. Allied Command (SHAPE, NORAD, etc.)
   5. Major Command HQ (USAREUR, TRADOC, First Army, etc.)
   6. MSC (Corps, Division, Tng Center, Post HQ)
   7. Brigade or equivalent level command
   8. Other

5. What is your current job assignment?

   1. Command
   2. Personnel
   3. Intelligence
   4. Plans and Opns
   5. Logistics and Procurement
   6. Research and Development
   7. Communications/Information Management
   8. Comptroller
   9. Education and Training
   10. Civilian Military Affairs
   11. Foreign Area Officer
   12. Other

6. Through which program did you receive MEL-1?

    1. Army War College Resident Course
    2. Army War College Corresponding Studies Program
    3. Senior Service College Fellow

7. What is your basic branch?

    1. Combat
    2. Combat support
    3. Combat service support
    4. Other

8. How many different duty positions have you had since completing the program which awarded you MEL-1?

    1. 1
    2. 2
    3. 3
    4. 4
    5. 5
    6. More than 5

9. In what calendar year did you receive your MEL-1?

    1. 1987
    2. 1986
    3. 1985
    4. 1984
    5. 1983

INTRODUCTION

The primary mission of the U.S. Army War College (USAWC) is to prepare officers for senior leadership positions in the Army, Defense and related Departments and Agencies. The USAWC academic themes are to (1) lead other professionals (serve competently as senior commanders, leaders, and managers, demonstrating and promoting the highest professional military values and ethical conduct), (2) work in the strategic environment (understand the national security policymaking process and the military role in it and be able to formulate global military strategy), (3) serve in joint and combined commands (determine military objectives and strategic concepts for worldwide contingencies using existing forces), (4) direct Army and DOD systems (understand the interdependencies of the systems and their relation to force integration and force structuring), (5) command at the operational level (formulate and execute joint and combined campaign plans for the successful conduct of war at the operational level), and (6) plan/operate theater/global forces (including mobilization and deployment and sustainment of forces involved in military operations throughout the spectrum of conflict). Based on the courses of instruction you undertook, please evaluate the following curriculum topics in terms of their usefulness (or degree of need) to you in your current assignment. The topics have been consolidated based on the Academic themes.

Use the scale below to answer questions 10 to 46.

If a particular topic was not covered in sufficient depth for you to evaluate usefulness, please respond with does not apply.

Does Not Apply 1	Not Useful at All 2	A Little Useful 3	Somewhat Useful 4	Very Useful 5	Extremely Useful 6	I don't Remember 7

LEAD OTHER PROFESSIONALS

10. Major issues in leading the Army.   1 2 3 4 5 6 7

11. Principles and techniques of the senior leader.   1 2 3 4 5 6 7

12. Assessing your general health and fitness.   1 2 3 4 5 6 7

13. Physical fitness as related to unit effectiveness.   1 2 3 4 5 6 7

14. Organization and functions of nonmilitary agencies.   1 2 3 4 5 6 7

15. Application of word processing and other automation/
    computer skills.   1 2 3 4 5 6 7

Does Not Apply 1	Not Useful at All 2	A Little Useful 3	Somewhat Useful 4	Very Useful 5	Extremely Useful 6	I don't Remember 7

WORK IN STRATEGIC ENVIRONMENTS

16. The process of formulating U.S. military and national security strategy.   1 2 3 4 5 6 7

17. Strategy and development of force structure.   1 2 3 4 5 6 7

18. Soviet economic, political, and foreign policies.   1 2 3 4 5 6 7

19. The working of the global economy.   1 2 3 4 5 6 7

20. The functioning of the U.S. economy and foreign policy.   1 2 3 4 5 6 7

21. Terrorism in today's global environment.   1 2 3 4 5 6 7

22. Military history - lessons learned.   1 2 3 4 5 6 7

23. Effective oral and written communication.   1 2 3 4 5 6 7

24. The practical application of briefing techniques.   1 2 3 4 5 6 7

SERVE IN JOINT AND COMBINED COMMANDS

25. The AirLand Battle doctrine and its applications.   1 2 3 4 5 6 7

26. Space as a potential military environment.   1 2 3 4 5 6 7

27. The capabilities and effects of U.S. Army weapon systems.   1 2 3 4 5 6 7

28. The influence the reorganization of JCS has on planning, doctrine and execution.   1 2 3 4 5 6 7

29. NATO organization, doctrine, and operations.   1 2 3 4 5 6 7

30. DOD roles, mission, and doctrine.   1 2 3 4 5 6 7

31. U.S. Army roles, mission, and doctrine.   1 2 3 4 5 6 7

32. U.S. Navy roles, mission, and doctrine.   1 2 3 4 5 6 7

33. U.S. Air Force roles, mission, and doctrine.   1 2 3 4 5 6 7

Does Not Apply 1	Not Useful at All 2	A Little Useful 3	Somewhat Useful 4	Very Useful 5	Extremely Useful 6	I don't Remember 7

34. U.S. Marine Corps roles, mission, and doctrine   1 2 3 4 5 6 7

35. The process of formulating joint military doctrine.   1 2 3 4 5 6 7

DIRECT ARMY AND DOD SYSTEMS

36. The planning, programming, and budgeting system.   1 2 3 4 5 6 7

37. How the Army resources, sustains and mobilizes forces to support national military strategy.   1 2 3 4 5 6 7

38. Managing and developing the Army's Management Systems.   1 2 3 4 5 6 7

COMMAND AT THE OPERATIONAL LEVEL

39. The impact of technology on modern warfare.   1 2 3 4 5 6 7

40. Analysis of the U.S. Army rear area doctrine and battle.   1 2 3 4 5 6 7

41. Joint strategic and operational planning.   1 2 3 4 5 6 7

42. The study and impact of low intensity conflict.   1 2 3 4 5 6 7

PLAN/OPERATE THEATER/GLOBAL FORCES

43. Strategies of campaign planning at the Unified Command level. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

44. Strategic and operational level decisionmaking in the employment of U.S. Forces.   1 2 3 4 5 6 7

45. The analysis of U.S. military strategy.   1 2 3 4 5 6 7

46. The study of the Soviet Armed Forces in relation to doctrine, operations, and capabilities.   1 2 3 4 5 6 7